

1 John B. Thorsness
2 J. Taylor Rounds
3 Clapp, Peterson, Tiemessen,
4 Thorsness & Johnson, LLC
5 711 H Street, Suite 620
6 Anchorage, AK 99501
7 (907) 272-9272 – phone
8 (907) 272-9586 – fax
9 usdc-anch-ntc@cplawak.com
10 Attorneys for Defendant
11 Evenflo Company, Inc.

12
13 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

15 TINA ERVIN, as mother of and on behalf
16 of A.H.E., a minor,

17 Plaintiff,

18 Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG

19 v.

20 EVENFLO COMPANY, INC.; TOYOTA
21 MOTOR CORPORATION; TOYOTA
22 MOTOR SALES, U.S.A.,

23 Defendants.

24
25 **DEFENDANTS' JOINT REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR**
ADDITIONAL TIME TO DEPOSE PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT CARLEY WARD

26 Defendant Evenflo Company, Inc. (hereinafter "Evenflo") and Defendants
27 Toyota Motor Corporation and Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A. (hereinafter "Toyota"),
28 by and through their counsel of record, hereby reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to
29 Defendants' Joint Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff's Expert Carley
30 Ward.

31 Defendants' Joint Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff's
32 Expert Carley Ward

33 *Ervin v. Evenflo Company, Inc.*, Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG

34 Page 1 of 6

1 **I. The Sole Issue Before the Court is the Length of Dr. Ward's Deposition**

2 Plaintiff agrees that Dr. Ward may be deposed regarding the opinions and
3 information contained in her rebuttal report. The sole issue before the Court is the
4 length of the deposition.

5 **II. Plaintiff Does Not Dispute the Foundational Elements of Defendants' Motion**

6 Plaintiff does not dispute that (a) Dr. Ward's "rebuttal report" contains
7 additional information and new opinions which were not disclosed in her initial
8 report, (b) neither Evenflo nor Toyota had an opportunity to examine Dr. Ward
9 regarding these new opinions, or (c) 1 hour and 17 minutes is insufficient for *both*
10 Evenflo and Toyota to fairly examine Dr. Ward as to the new material in her
11 "rebuttal report." Plaintiff doggedly relies on the presumptive time limit in Rule
12 30(d)(1) and argues that Defendants have somehow "created their own dilemma"
13 by "prematurely" deposing Dr. Ward.¹

14 **III. Counsel's Claim Notwithstanding, "Normal Process" is to Follow the Civil Rules and Decisional Authority**

15 Contrary to Plaintiff's argument, Defendants were not required to wait to
16 depose Plaintiff's experts until all initial and rebuttal expert reports were
17 exchanged.² Indeed, the purpose of staggered expert report deadlines is to

18
19
20
21
22 ¹ Likewise, Plaintiff quotes but ignores the salient language that follows the 7 hour
23 limit, which provides for "additional time ... if needed to fairly examine the deponent
24 "

25 ² With all due respect, counsel is "playing the old lawyer card" which seasoned trial
26 lawyers such as Mr. Flanigan sometimes use to buttress assertions that do not have
27 support in the Civil Rules or case law.

1 promote efficiency, eliminate “guess work” and otherwise focus the opinions of
2 Defendants’ experts before they submit their reports.³

3 Dr. Ward has submitted a “rebuttal report” that contains new opinions and
4 information. If Defendants are not given a reasonable amount of time to examine
5 her concerning this new information, the reason for staggered reports and Rule
6 26’s fundamental purpose of avoiding surprise at trial (and encouraging pre-trial
7 resolution) will be thwarted.

8 **IV. The Advisory Committee Anticipated the Very Situation Presented Here**

9 Further, Plaintiff ignores the fact that Evenflo and Toyota are separate
10 parties defending against distinct claims, impugning the design and performance of
11 wholly different products. *Both* Evenflo and Toyota must have a chance to “fairly
12 examine” Dr. Ward regarding her new opinions in this matter. Indeed, the Advisory
13 Committee Notes to Civil Rule 30 recognize that “[i]n multi-party cases, the need
14 for each party to examine the witness may warrant additional time” This
15 comment is particularly relevant as it applies to the deposition of Plaintiff’s primary
16 liability expert, Dr. Ward. She offers opinions on multiple subjects, on a variety of
17 different disciplines, which are independently critical of both Evenflo and Toyota.
18 While Defendants will studiously avoid duplicative questioning, Evenflo and Toyota
19 cannot both adequately examine Dr. Ward as to her new opinions in only 1 hour
20 and 17 minutes.

21
22
23
24
25 ³ Plaintiff did not object to staggered deadlines.

26 Defendants’ Joint Reply to Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff’s
Expert Carley Ward
Ervin v. Evenflo Company, Inc., Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG
Page 3 of 6

V. Plaintiff Does Not Complain of Material Prejudice

Plaintiff has not made any showing that she will be prejudiced by allowing Defendants additional time to depose Dr. Ward. Indeed, Plaintiff's counsel will certainly attend the deposition regardless of its length, and Defendants have agreed to compensate Dr. Ward at her normal hourly rate. A few additional hours will not prejudice Plaintiff.

VI. Plaintiff's "Floodgates" Argument is Unpersuasive

Finally, Plaintiff's argument about retaking Defendants' 30(b)(6) depositions is a "red herring." 30(b)(6) witnesses testify to *facts* pertaining to specific categories. They do not render opinions and submit reports. Had the Defendants' 30 (b)(6) witnesses materially changed or supplemented their factual testimony in correction sheets, Plaintiff would have grounds to examine them in a follow-up deposition, regardless of how much "on record" time was expended in the first deposition. Unlike with Dr. Ward, this did not occur.

VII. Conclusion

Defendants do not seek to “re-depose” Dr. Ward, as Plaintiff states. Instead, Defendants request additional time to depose Dr. Ward on *new* opinions and *new* information contained in her “rebuttal report.” As set forth in Defendants’ motion, good cause exists to allow Defendants to depose Dr. Ward for an additional 3.5 hours regarding her “rebuttal report.” Plaintiff has failed to articulate a legitimate reason for refusing to allow this additional time. Accordingly, Defendants’ motion should be granted.

Defendants' Joint Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff's Expert Carley Ward
Ervin v. Evenflo Company, Inc., Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG
Page 4 of 6

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 8th day of June, 2018.

CLAPP, PETERSON, TIEMESSEN,
THORSNESS & JOHNSON LLC
Attorneys for Defendant Evenflo Company,
Inc.

By /s/ John B. Thorsness
John B. Thorsness, ABA No. 8211154

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 8th day of June, 2018.

HUGHES WHITE COLBO WILCOX
& TERVOOREN, LLC
Attorneys for Defendants
Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. and
Toyota Motor Corporation

By /s/ Steven S. Tervooren (consent)
ABA No. 7910085

**Clapp, Peterson, Tiemessen,
Thorsness & Johnson, LLC**
711 H Street, Suite 620
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3454
(907) 272-9272 fax (907) 272-9586

Defendants' Joint Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff's Expert Carley Ward

Expert: Casey Ward
Ervin v. Evenflo Company, Inc., Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG

Page 5 of 6

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 8th day of June, 2018, a copy of the foregoing document was served electronically through the ECF system on:

Michael W. Flanigan, Esq.
mflanigan@farnorthlaw.com
irasor@farnorthlaw.com

Steven S. Tervooren, Esq.
stervooren@hugheswhite.com
aprice@hugheswhite.com

James W. Halbrooks, Jr.
james.halbrooks@bowmanandbrooke.com
carol.dorsa@bowmanandbrooke.com
cheryl.pedrolie@bowmanandbrooke.com

Suzanne H. Swaner, Esq.
suzanne.swaner@bowmanandbrooke.com
kathy.dobbs@bowmanandbrooke.com

By: /s/ John B. Thorsness

**Clapp, Peterson, Tremessen,
Thorsness & Johnson, LLC**
711 H Street, Suite 620
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3454
(907) 272-9272 fax (907) 272-9554

Defendants' Joint Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Additional Time to Depose Plaintiff's Expert Carley Ward

Ervin v. Evenflo Company, Inc., Case No. 3:14-cv-00234-SLG

Page 6 of 6